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## Introduction

Let $X$ be a real Banach space and let $A$ be a multivalued operator from $X$ into $X$, that is, to each $x \in X$ a subset $A x$ of $X$ be assigned. We define $D(A)=$ $\{x \in X ; A x \neq \phi\}, R(A)=\bigcup_{x \in X} A x$ and $G(A)=\left\{\left[x, x^{\prime}\right] \in X \times X ; x^{\prime} \in A x\right\}$. We denote by $F$ the duality mapping of $X$ into the dual space $X^{*}$, i.e., it is defined by $F x=$ $\left.\left\{x^{*} \in X^{*} ;<x, x^{*}\right\rangle=\|x\|^{2}=\left\|x^{*}\right\|^{2}\right\}$ for $x \in X$, where $<,>$ denotes the natural pairing between $X$ and $X^{*}$ and $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the norms in $X$ and $X^{*}$. An operator $A$ is called accretive in $X$, if for any $\left[x_{i}, x_{i}^{\prime}\right] \in G(A), i=1,2$, there is an element $f \in F\left(x_{1}-x_{2}\right)$ such that $\left\langle x_{1}^{\prime}-x_{2}^{\prime}, f\right\rangle \geq 0$, or equivalently,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{h \ngtr 0} \frac{1}{h}\left[\left\|x_{1}-x_{2}+h\left(x_{1}^{\prime}-x_{2}^{\prime}\right)\right\|-\left\|x_{1}-x_{2}\right\|\right] \geq 0 \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

(see R. H. Martin, Jr. [7]). An accretive operator $A$ is called m-accretive, if $R(A+I)=X$.

It was shown in [6; Theorem 1] that, under the uniform convexity of $X^{*}$, an accretive operator $A$ is $m$-accretive if and only if it is demiclosed (i.e., for any sequence $\left\{\left[x_{n}, x_{n}^{\prime}\right]\right\} \subset G(A), x_{n} \rightarrow x$ strongly and $x_{n}^{\prime} \rightarrow x^{\prime}$ weakly in $X$ imply that $\left.\left[x, x^{\prime}\right] \in G(A)\right)$ and for each $z \in X$ and each $x \in D(A)$, the initial value problem: $u^{\prime}(t)+A u(t)+z \ni 0, u(0)=x$ has a strong solution on $[0, \infty)$. In this note we do not require the uniform convexity of $X^{*}$ and shall show an analogue of the above result in more general spaces, namely, in reflexive Banach spaces, by making use of the inequality (1) for accretiveness.

## 1. Main results

Let $A$ be an operator from $X$ into $X$ and $\Omega=[0, r)$ or $[0, r]$ where $0<r \leq \infty$. Then an $X$-valued function $u$ on $\Omega$ is called a strong solution of the initial value problem

$$
u^{\prime}(t)+A u(t) \ni 0, \quad u(0)=a,
$$

if $u(t)$ is strongly absolutely continuous on any bounded closed interval contained in $\Omega, u(0)=a$ and the strong derivative $u^{\prime}(t)$ exists, $u(t) \in D(A)$ and $u^{\prime}(t)+A u(t) \ni 0$ for a.e. $t \in \Omega$. We denote by $\hat{D}(A)$ the set
$\left\{x \in X\right.$; there is a sequence $\left\{\left[x_{n}, x_{n}^{\prime}\right]\right\} \subset G(A)$ such that

$$
\left.x_{n} \xrightarrow{s} x \text { in } X \text { as } n \rightarrow \infty \quad \text { and }\left\{\left\|x_{n}^{\prime}\right\|\right\} \text { is bounded }\right\}
$$

where " $\xrightarrow{s}$ " means convergence in the strong topology. We say that $A$ is almost demiclosed, if $\hat{D}(A)=D(A)$. It is obvious that if $A$ is demiclosed, then it is almost demiclosed, provided that $X$ is reflexive.

Theorem 1. Suppose that $X$ is reflexive. Let $A$ be an accretive operator from $X$ into $X$. Then the following statements are equivalent to each other: $\left(a_{1}\right) \quad A$ is $m$-accretive.
$\left(a_{2}\right) \quad A$ is almost demiclosed, and for each $x \in D(A)$ and each $z \in X$ the initial value problem

$$
u^{\prime}(t)+A u(t)+z \ni 0, \quad u(0)=x
$$

has a strong solution on $[0, \infty)$.
( $a_{3}$ ) For each $x \in \hat{D}(A)$ and each $z \in X$, the initial value problem

$$
\begin{equation*}
u^{\prime}(t)+A u(t)+z \ni 0, \quad u(0)=x \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

has a strong solution on $[0, \infty)$.
Let $X_{0}$ be a subset of $X$ and let $T=\{T(t) ; t \geq 0\}$ be a family of singlevalued operators from $X_{0}$ into $X_{0}$. We say that $T$ is a contraction semigroup on $X_{0}$, if (i) $T\left(t+t^{\prime}\right) x=T(t) T\left(t^{\prime}\right) x$
for $t, t^{\prime} \geq 0$ and $x \in X_{0}$,
(ii) $\|T(t) x-T(t) y\| \leq\|x-y\| \quad$ for $t \geq 0 \quad$ and $\quad x, y \in X_{0}$,
(iii) $T(0) x=x$
for $x \in X_{0}$,
(iv) the function $t \rightarrow T(t) x$ is strongly continuous on $[0, \infty)$ for each $x \in X_{0}$. We define the strong (resp. weak) infinitesimal generator $G_{s}$ (resp. $G_{w}$ ) of $T$ by

$$
G_{s} x=\mathrm{s}-\lim _{t \downarrow 0} \frac{T(t) x-x}{t}\left(\operatorname{resp} . G_{w} x=\mathrm{w}-\lim _{t \downarrow 0} \frac{T(t) x-x}{t}\right)
$$

whenever the limit exists. Here, the symbol "s-lim" (resp. "w-lim") means convergence in the strong (resp. weak) topology.

Theorem 2. Suppose that $X$ is reflexive. Let $A$ be an accretive operator from $X$ into $X$. Then the following statements are equivalent to each other: $\left(b_{1}\right) A$ is m-accretive.
( $b_{2}$ ) For each $z \in X$, there is a contraction semigroup $T^{(z)}=\left\{T^{(z)}(t) ; t \geq 0\right\}$ on $\overline{D(A)}$ such that $G\left(-G_{s}^{(z)}\right) \subset G(A+z)$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
D(A) \subset\left\{x \in \overline{D(A)} ; \liminf _{t+0} \frac{\left\|T^{(z)}(t) x-x\right\|}{t}<\infty\right\}, \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $G_{s}^{(z)}$ is the strong infinitesimal generator of $T^{(z)}$.
$\left(b_{3}\right)$ For each $z \in X$, there is a contraction semigroup $T^{(z)}=\left\{T^{(z)}(t) ; t \geq 0\right\}$ on $\overline{D(A)}$ with the property (3) such that $G\left(-G_{w}^{(z)}\right) \subset G(\mathrm{~A}+z)$, where $G_{w}^{(z)}$ is the weak infinitesimal generator of $T^{(z)}$.

The following two corollaries are obtained from Theorem 2 by the same method as in the proofs of Corollaries 1 and 2 in [6].

Corollary 1. (F. E. Browder [2]) Suppose that $X$ is reflexive. Let $A$ be a singlevalued accretive operator from $X$ into $X$. Then $A$ is $m$-accretive if and only if for each $z \in X$ there is a contraction semigroup on $\overline{D(A)}$ whose weak infinitesimal generator is $-(A+z)$.

For an operator $B$ from $X$ into $X$ we define $B^{0}$ by $B^{0} x=\left\{x^{\prime} \in B x ;\left\|x^{\prime}\right\|=\right.$ $\|B x\| \|\}$, where $\|E\|\left\|=\inf _{y \in E}\right\| y \|$ for a subset $E$ of $X$.

Corollary 2. Suppose that $X$ is reflexive and $X$ and $X^{*}$ are strictly convex. Let $A$ be an accretive operator from $X$ into $X$. Then $A$ is m-accretive if and only if for each $z \in X$ the operator $(A+z)^{0}$ is singlevalued, $D\left((A+z)^{0}\right)=$ $D(A)$ and there is a contraction semigroup on $\overline{D(A)}$ whose weak infinitesimal generator is $-(A+z)^{0}$.

## 2. Proof of Theorem 1.

Hereafter we assume that $X$ is reflexive. For the proof of the assertion $\left(a_{1}\right) \rightarrow\left(a_{2}\right)$ of Theorem 1 we first show the following lemma.

Lemma 1. If $A$ is m-accretive, then it is almost demiclosed.
Proof. First we recall the generation theorem by M. G. Crandall and T. M. Liggett [3; Theorem I]. The theorem says that if $A$ is $m$-accretive, then there is a contraction semigroup $T=\{T(t) ; t \geq 0\}$ on $\overline{D(A)}$ such that

$$
T(t) x=\mathrm{s}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lim _{n \rightarrow \infty}\left(I+\frac{t}{n} A\right)^{-n} x \quad \text { for } \quad t \geq 0 \quad \text { and } \quad x \in \overline{D(A)}
$$

and this contraction semigroup has the following property:

$$
\left\|T(t) x-T\left(t^{\prime}\right) x\right\| \leq\left\|\left|A x \|\left|t-t^{\prime}\right| \quad \text { for } \quad t, t^{\prime} \geq 0 \quad \text { and } \quad x \in D(A)\right.\right.
$$

Now, assume that $\left[x_{n}, x_{n}^{\prime}\right] \in G(A), x_{n} \xrightarrow{s} x$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $\left\|x_{n}^{\prime}\right\| \leq M$ for all $n$. Then, from the above property of $T$ it follows that $\left\|T(t) x_{n}-x_{n}\right\| \leq\left\|x_{n}^{\prime}\right\| t$ for $t \geq 0$. Hence, letting $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have $\|T(t) x-x\| \leq M t$ for $t \geq 0$. By Corollary 1 in I. Miyadera [8] we have $x \in D(A)$. Thus $A$ is almost demiclosed.
q.e.d.

The assertion $\left(a_{1}\right) \rightarrow\left(a_{2}\right)$ of Theorem 1 easily follows from the above lemma and Theorems I and II in [3], and the assertion $\left(a_{2}\right) \rightarrow\left(a_{3}\right)$ of Theorem 1 is trivial.

Next we shall prove the assertion $\left(a_{3}\right) \rightarrow\left(a_{1}\right)$ of Theorem 1 by means of a sequence of lemmas which are valid under the assumption $\left(a_{3}\right)$. Thus, hereafter, assume ( $a_{3}$ ).

Lemma 2. ( $\alpha$ ) $A$ is closed (i.e., $\left[x_{n}, x_{n}^{\prime}\right] \in G(A), x_{n} \xrightarrow{s} x$ and $x_{n}^{\prime} \xrightarrow{s} x^{\prime}$ in $X$ imply that $\left[x, x^{\prime}\right] \in G(A)$ ).
( $\beta$ ) Let $\widetilde{A}$ be any accretive operator such that $G(\widetilde{A}) \supset G(A)$. Then $\widehat{D}(A) \cap D(\widetilde{A})$ $=D(A)$ and $\tilde{A} x=A x$ for every $x \in D(A)$.

Proof. Assume that $\left[x_{n}, x_{n}^{\prime}\right] \in G(A), x_{n} \xrightarrow{s} x$ and $x_{n}^{\prime} \xrightarrow{s} x^{\prime}$ in $X$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then $x \in \widehat{D}(A)$. By $\left(a_{3}\right)$, the initial value problem: $u^{\prime}(t)+A u(t)-x^{\prime} \ni 0$, $u(0)=x$ has a strong solution $u(t)$ on $[0, \infty)$. Let $B$ be the operator given by $G(B)=G(A) \cup\left\{\left[x, x^{\prime}\right]\right\}$. Then $u(t)$ is also a strong solution of the initial value problem: $u^{\prime}(t)+B u(t)-x^{\prime} \ni 0, u(0)=x$. Therefore, since $B$ is also accretive, the uniqueness of a strong solution (cf., T. Kato [5; Lemma 6.2] or H. Brezis and A. Pazy [1; Lemma 2.2]) implies that $u(t)=x$ for all $t \geq 0$, and hence $\left[x, x^{\prime}\right] \in G(A)$. Thus ( $\alpha$ ) is proved, and $(\beta)$ is also proved just as $(\alpha)$.
q.e.d.

Now we consider the initial value problem

$$
\begin{equation*}
u^{\prime}(t)+A u(t)+u(t) \ni 0, \quad u(0)=a \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

and shall show that (4) has a strong solution on $[0, \infty)$ for each $a \in D(A)$.
Let $a \in D(A)$. For a positive integer $n$ we define an $X$-valued function $u_{n}$ as follows. Let $v(t)$ be a strong solution of (2) with $x=z=a$ and choose a positive number $\delta_{n}^{1}$ such that $\frac{1}{n}-\frac{1}{n^{2}} \leq \delta_{n}^{1} \leq \frac{1}{n},-v^{\prime}\left(\delta_{n}^{1}\right) \in A v\left(\delta_{n}^{1}\right)+a$ and $\left\|v^{\prime}\left(\delta_{n}^{1}\right)\right\|=\left\|A v\left(\delta_{n}^{1}\right)+a\right\| \leq\|A a+a\| . \quad$ In fact, in view of Lemma 2.2 in [1], such $\delta_{n}^{1}$ exists. Let us define $u_{n}(t)=v(t)$ if $t \in\left[0, t_{n}^{1}\right], t_{n}^{1}=\delta_{n}^{1}$. Next we assume that $u_{n}$ is already defined on $\left[0, t_{n}^{k}\right], 1 \leq k<n$. Let $w(t)$ be a strong solution of (2) with $x=z=u_{n}\left(t_{n}^{k}\right)$, and choose a positive number $\delta_{n}^{k+1}$ such that $\frac{1}{n}-\frac{1}{n^{2}}$ $\leq \delta_{n}^{k+1} \leq \frac{1}{n},-w^{\prime}\left(\delta_{n}^{k+1}\right) \in A w\left(\delta_{n}^{k+1}\right)+u_{n}\left(t_{n}^{k}\right)$ and $\left\|w^{\prime}\left(\delta_{n}^{k+1}\right)\right\|=\left\|A w\left(\delta_{n}^{k+1}\right)+u_{n}\left(t_{n}^{k}\right)\right\|$ $\leq\| \| A u_{n}\left(t_{k}^{n}\right)+u_{n}\left(t_{n}^{k}\right) \|$. Let us define $u_{n}(t)=w\left(t-t_{n}^{k}\right)$ if $t \in\left[t_{n}^{k}, t_{n}^{k+1}\right], t_{n}^{k+1}=\delta_{n}^{k+1}+t_{n}^{k}$. Thus by induction $u_{n}$ is defined on $\left[0, t_{n}^{n}\right]$. Clearly $1-\frac{1}{n} \leq t_{n}^{n} \leq 1$. We see that $u_{n}$ is strongly absolutely continuous on $\left[0, t_{n}^{n}\right]$ and satisfies

$$
u_{n}^{\prime}(t)+A u_{n}(t)+u_{n}\left(t_{n}^{k}\right) \ni 0 \quad \text { a.e. on } \quad\left[t_{n}^{k}, t_{n}^{k+1}\right]
$$

for $k=0,1, \ldots, n-1$.
Lemma 3. Set $K=|\|A a+a \mid\|$. Then for each $n$

$$
\left\|u_{n}^{\prime}(t)\right\| \leq \mathrm{e} K \quad \text { a.e. on } \quad\left[0, t_{n}^{n}\right]
$$

This lemma is obtained by a simple modification of the proof of Lemma 6 in [6].

Lemma 4. The sequence $\left\{u_{n}\right\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is strongly uniformly convergent on $[0,1)$, and the limit $u(t)$ satisfies

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left\|u(t)-u\left(t^{\prime}\right)\right\| \leq \mathrm{e} K\left|t-t^{\prime}\right| \quad \text { for } t, t^{\prime} \geq 0  \tag{6}\\
& u(0)=a \quad \text { and } \quad u(t) \in \widehat{D}(A) \quad \text { for all } t \geq 0 \tag{7}
\end{align*}
$$

Proof. Set $P_{n, m}(t)=\left\|u_{n}(t)-u_{m}(t)\right\|$ on $\left[0,1-\frac{1}{n}-\frac{1}{m}\right]$. If $s \in\left(t_{n}^{i}, t_{n}^{i+1}\right]$, $s \in\left(t_{m}^{j}, t_{m}^{j+1}\right], u_{n}^{\prime}(s)+U_{n}(s)+u_{n}\left(t_{n}^{i}\right)=0$ and $u_{m}^{\prime}(s)+U_{m}(s)+u_{m}\left(t_{m}^{j}\right)=0$, where $U_{n}(s)$ $\in A u_{n}(s)$ and $U_{m}(s) \in A u_{m}(s)$, then

$$
\begin{aligned}
P_{n, m}^{\prime}(s)= & \lim _{h \downarrow 0}-\frac{1}{h}\left[\left\|u_{n}(s)-u_{m}(s)+h\left(U_{n}(s)+u_{n}\left(t_{n}^{i}\right)-U_{m}(s)-u_{m}\left(t_{m}^{j}\right)\right)\right\|\right. \\
& \left.-\left\|u_{n}(s)-u_{m}(s)\right\|\right] \\
\leq & \lim _{h \downarrow 0}-\frac{1}{h}\left[\left\|u_{n}(s)-u_{m}(s)+h\left(U_{n}(s)+u_{n}(s)-U_{m}(s)-u_{m}(s)\right)\right\|\right. \\
& \left.-\left\|u_{n}(s)-u_{m}(s)\right\|\right]+\left\|u_{n}(s)-u_{n}\left(t_{n}^{i}\right)\right\|+\left\|u_{m}(s)-u_{m}\left(t_{m}^{j}\right)\right\|
\end{aligned}
$$

Now, $U_{n}(s)+u_{n}(s) \in(A+I) u_{n}(s)$ and $U_{m}(s)+u_{m}(s) \in(A+I) u_{m}(s)$. Since $A+I$ is also accretive, it follows from (1) in the introduction that

$$
\begin{gathered}
\lim _{h \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{h}\left[\left\|u_{n}(s)-u_{m}(s)+h\left(U_{n}(s)+u_{n}(s)-U_{m}(s)-u_{m}(s)\right)\right\|\right. \\
\left.-\left\|u_{n}(s)-u_{m}(s)\right\|\right] \geq 0
\end{gathered}
$$

Hence, by (5),

$$
P_{n, m}^{\prime}(s) \leq\left\|u_{n}(s)-u_{n}\left(t_{n}^{i}\right)\right\|+\left\|u_{m}(s)-u_{m}\left(t_{m}^{j}\right)\right\| \leq \mathrm{e} K\left(\frac{1}{n}+\frac{1}{m}\right)
$$

Thus,

$$
\frac{d}{d t}\left\|u_{n}(t)-u_{m}(t)\right\| \leq \mathrm{e} K\left(\frac{1}{n}+\frac{1}{m}\right) \quad \text { for } \quad \text { a.e. } \quad t \in\left[0,1-\frac{1}{n}-\frac{1}{m}\right]
$$

Hence $\left\|u_{n}(t)-u_{m}(t)\right\| \leq \mathrm{e} K\left(\frac{1}{n}+\frac{1}{m}\right)$ for all $t \in\left[0,1-\frac{1}{n}-\frac{1}{m}\right]$ and hence $\left\|u_{n}(t)-u_{m}(t)\right\| \rightarrow 0$ uniformly on $[0,1)$ as $n, m \rightarrow \infty$. Let $u(t)$ be the limit. Since
$\left\|u_{n}(t)-u_{n}\left(t^{\prime}\right)\right\| \leq \mathrm{e} K\left|t-t^{\prime}\right|$ for any $t, t^{\prime} \in\left[0,1-\frac{1}{n}\right]$ by (5), by letting $n \rightarrow \infty$ we have (6). Clearly $u(0)=a$. The fact that $u(t) \in \hat{D}(A)$ for all $t \geq 0$ follows from (5). Thus we have (7).
q.e.d.

We define $<x, y>_{s}=\sup _{y^{*} \in F_{y}}<x, y^{*}>$ for $x, y \in X$. Then $<,>_{s}: X \times X \rightarrow$ $(-\infty, \infty)$ is upper semicontinuous in the strong topology of $X \times X$ (see [3; Lemma 2.16]). Then the limit function $u$ of $\left\{u_{n}\right\}$ has the following property:

Lemma 5. For any $\left[x, x^{\prime}\right] \in G(A)$ and any $t, s \in[0,1)$ with $t \geq s$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\|u(t)-x\|^{2}-\|u(s)-x\|^{2} \leq 2 \int_{s}^{t}<-x^{\prime}-u(\tau), u(\tau)-x>_{s} d \tau \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. By the definition of $u_{n}, u_{n}^{\prime}(t)+U_{n}(t)+u_{n}\left(t_{n}^{k}\right)=0$ a.e. on $\left[t_{n}^{k}, t_{n}^{k+1}\right]$, $k=0,1, \ldots, n-1$, where $U_{n}(t) \in A u_{n}(t)$ a.e. on $\left[0, t_{n}^{n}\right)$. For each $t$, by the accretiveness of $A$, there is $S_{n}(t) \in F\left(u_{n}(t)-x\right)$ such that $\left\langle U_{n}(t)-x^{\prime}, S_{n}(t)\right\rangle \geq 0$. Hence, by using Lemma 1.3 of T. Kato [4] and Lemma 3, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{d t}\left\|u_{n}(t)-x\right\|^{2} & =<u_{n}^{\prime}(t), S_{n}(t)> \\
& =<-U_{n}(t)-u_{n}\left(t_{n}^{k}\right), S_{n}(t)> \\
& \leq<-x^{\prime}-u_{n}(t), S_{n}(t)>+<u_{n}(t)-u_{n}\left(t_{n}^{k}\right), S_{n}(t)> \\
& \leq<-x^{\prime}-u_{n}(t), u_{n}(t)-x>_{s}+\frac{\mathrm{e} K}{n}\left\|u_{n}(t)-x\right\| \\
& \leq<-x^{\prime}-u_{n}(t), u_{n}(t)-x>_{s}+\frac{\mathrm{e} K}{n}(\|x\|+\|a\|+\mathrm{e} K)
\end{aligned}
$$

Integrating the first and the last members of the above inequalities on $[s, t]$, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left\|u_{n}(t)-x\right\|^{2}-\left\|u_{n}(s)-x\right\|^{2}  \tag{9}\\
& \leq 2 \int_{s}^{t}<-x^{\prime}-u_{n}(\tau), u_{n}(\tau)-x>_{s} d \tau+\frac{2}{n} \mathrm{e} K|t-s|(\|x\|+\|a\|+\mathrm{e} K) .
\end{align*}
$$

On the other hand, since $u_{n} \xrightarrow{s} u$ and $\left\{u_{n}\right\}$ is uniformly bounded on [0,1), it follows from Fatou's lemma and the upper semicontinuity of $<,>_{s}: X \times X \rightarrow R$ that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \limsup _{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{s}^{t}<-x^{\prime}-u_{n}(\tau), u_{n}(\tau)-x>_{s} d \tau \\
& \leq \int_{s}^{t} \limsup _{n \rightarrow \infty}<-x^{\prime}-u_{n}(\tau), u_{n}(\tau)-x>_{s} d \tau \\
& \leq \int_{s}^{t}<-x^{\prime}-u(\tau), u(\tau)-x>_{s} d \tau .
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, letting $n \rightarrow \infty$ in (9), we obtain (8).
q.e.d.

Lemma 6. $u(t)$ is a strong solution on $[0,1)$ of $u^{\prime}(t)+A u(t)+u(t) \ni 0$, $u(0)=a$.

Proof. We shall prove that

$$
\begin{equation*}
<-u^{\prime}(t)-u(t)-x^{\prime}, u(t)-x>_{s} \geq 0 \quad \text { for a.e. } t \in[0,1) \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

for any $\left[x, x^{\prime}\right] \in G(A)$. In fact, let $\left[x, x^{\prime}\right] \in G(A)$ be an arbitrary element. Then we first observe that for $s, t \geq 0$ with $s>t$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& <u(s)-u(t), u(t)-x>_{s} \\
& \leq<u(s)-x, u(t)-x>_{s}-\|u(t)-x\|^{2} \\
& \leq\|u(s)-x\|\|u(t)-x\|-\|u(t)-x\|^{2} \\
& \leq \frac{1}{2}\|u(s)-x\|^{2}-\frac{1}{2}\|u(t)-x\|^{2} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence from (8) we obtain

$$
<\frac{u(s)-u(t)}{s-t}, u(t)-x>_{s} \leq \frac{1}{s-t} \int_{t}^{s}<-x^{\prime}-u(\tau), u(\tau)-x>_{s} d \tau .
$$

Here, if $u$ is strongly differentiable at $t$, then we infer from the above inequality and the upper semicontinuity of $\langle,\rangle_{s}$ that

$$
<u^{\prime}(t), u(t)-x>_{s} \leq<-x^{\prime}-u(t), u(t)-x>_{s} .
$$

Thus (10) holds. Next, fix any $t$ at which $u$ is strongly differentiable and define an operator $\tilde{A}$ by $G(\tilde{A})=G(A) \cup\left\{\left[u(t),-u^{\prime}(t)-u(t)\right]\right\}$. Then (10) implies that $\tilde{A}$ is accretive. Applying $(\beta)$ of Lemma 2 for this $\tilde{A}$, we have $u(t) \in D(A)$ and $\tilde{A} u(t)=A u(t)$, since $u(t) \in \widehat{D}(A)$ by (7). Thus

$$
-u^{\prime}(t)-u(t) \in A u(t) \quad \text { a.e. on } \quad[0,1)
$$

Proof of the assertion $\left(a_{3}\right) \rightarrow\left(a_{1}\right)$ of Theorem 1: We have seen that for each $a \in D(A)$ the initial value problem (4) has a local strong solution $u(t)$. By using a standard argument we deduce that $u(t)$ can be extended to a strong solution of (4) on $[0, \infty)$. Therefore, by Lemma 9 in [6] and ( $\alpha$ ) of Lemma 2, $0 \in R(A+I)$. For an arbitrary point $z \in X$, replacing $A$ by $A-z$ in the above argument, we conclude that $z \in R(A+I)$. Thus $R(A+I)=X$.
q.e.d.

Remark. The assertion of Theorem 1 is false without the reflexivity of the space $X$; in fact there are a non-reflexive Banach space $X$ and an $m$-accretive operator $A$ in $X$ such that the Cauchy problem: $u^{\prime}(t)+A u(t) \ni 0, u(0)=a$ does
not have a strong solution, even if $a \in D(A)$. For an example, see G. F. Webb [9].

## 3. Proof of Theorem 2.

We can prove Theorem 2 just as Theorem 2 in [6], using Theorem 1.
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